

STATEMENT BY PROPONENTS/AUTHORS OF ARGUMENTS

(Section 9600 of the Elections Code requires that all arguments concerning measures shall be accompanied by the following form statement, to be signed by each proponent and by each author, if different, of the argument).

The undersigned proponent(s) or author(s) of the Rebuttal argument IN FAVOR
(PRIMARY OR REBUTTAL) (IN FAVOR OR AGAINST)
ballot measure 3 at the Rancho Mirage General Election
(LETTER) (TITLE OF ELECTION)
for the City of Rancho Mirage to be held on April 12, 2016
(DISTRICT OR JURISDICTION) (DATE)
hereby state that such argument is true and correct to the best of Their knowledge and belief.
(HIS/HER/THEIR)

PROponent's/AUTHOR's NAME:

SIGNATURE:

1. Gary Lueders, Vice President
Friends of CV Link

PRINTED NAME (TITLE OPTIONAL) _____

ADDRESS _____

(PHONE) _____
SIGNATURE _____
January 11, 2016

DATE
2. Larry Parrish, Retired CEO
Riverside County

PRINTED NAME (TITLE OPTIONAL) _____

ADDRESS _____

(PHONE) _____
SIGNATURE _____
January 11, 2016

DATE
3. Robert Brockman, Former Community Director
City of Rancho Mirage

PRINTED NAME (TITLE OPTIONAL) _____

ADDRESS _____

(PHONE) _____
SIGNATURE _____
January 11, 2016

DATE
4. David Firestone
Desert Bicycle Club Member

PRINTED NAME (TITLE OPTIONAL) _____

ADDRESS _____

(PHONE) _____
SIGNATURE _____
January 11, 2016

DATE
5. Roger Snoble, Retired CEO
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

PRINTED NAME (TITLE OPTIONAL) _____

ADDRESS _____

(PHONE) _____
SIGNATURE _____
January 11, 2016

DATE

RECEIVED
2016 JAN 11 PM 3:04
CITY OF RANCHO MIRAGE
OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK

Measure 3

The Council opens their argument with “assumes.” That’s precisely the problem: The Council makes many wrong assumptions to craft their arguments.

Their argument cherry-picked a single number out of a complicated, 11-page report and assumed a number out of context. It highlighted a single sentence from a 167-page master plan and assumed they knew what it meant. Worse yet, they assume that voters should be swayed by out-of-date projections.

The Council makes assumptions because THE FACTS don’t support their argument:

- The current cost projections show the per-mile cost of CV Link is on par with what Rancho Mirage and other cities are already paying for local trails.
- The Coachella Valley Association of Governments has outlined about 2 dozen options to pay for long-term costs. But since the route is still being finalized, the Executive Committee – including the City of Rancho Mirage – has held off on picking the best option.
- CVAG never asked any city for a contribution.
- Private-sector interests have already shown interest in paying for any long-term costs.

The Desert Sun has highlighted Mayor Hobart’s exaggerations, stating that he “swung and missed” with his inflated projections about the long-term costs. If previous councils had used these exaggerations and scare tactics, we would have never had the vision to connect the Valley with Highway 111.

VOTE YES ON MEASURE 3.

Gary Lueders

Vice President, Friends of CV Link

Larry Parrish

Retired CEO Riverside County

Robert Brockman

Former Rancho Mirage Community Development Director

David Firestone

Desert Bicycle Club Member

Roger Snoble

Retired CEO Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority